

Assigned for all purposes to: Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Judicial Officer: Barbara Scheper

1 Caspar Jivalagian, Esq., State Bar No.: 282818  
2 Vache Thomassian, Esq., State Bar No.: 289053  
3 **KJT LAW GROUP, LLP**  
4 230 N. Maryland Avenue, Suite 306  
5 Glendale, California 91206  
6 Telephone: 818-507-8525  
7 Facsimile: 818-507-8588

8 Attorneys for Plaintiff,  
9 **BERJ PARSEGHIAN**

10  
11 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**  
12 **COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

13 **BERJ PARSEGHIAN, in the public interest,**

14 **Plaintiff,**

15 **v.**

16 **Smart & Final, LLC; and DOES 1 through 100,**  
17 **inclusive,**

18 **Defendants.**

Civil Action No.:

**21STCV29355**

**COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF  
AND CIVIL PENALTIES**

[Cal. Health and Safety Code Sec. 25249.6, *et seq.*]

**KJT** LAWGROUP LLP  
Jivalagian | Thomassian

1 Berj Parseghian, in the public interest, based on information and belief and investigation of  
2 counsel, except for information based on knowledge, hereby makes the following allegations.

3 **INTRODUCTION**

4 1. This Complaint seeks to remedy Defendant’s continuing failure to adequately warn  
5 individuals in California that they are being exposed to cadmium, a chemical known to the State of  
6 California to cause birth defects and other reproductive harm. Such exposures have occurred, and  
7 continue to occur, through the manufacture, distribution, sale and consumption of Defendant’s  
8 Crystallized Ginger (the “Product”). The Product is available to consumers in California through a  
9 multitude of retail channels including, without limitation (a) third-party traditional brick-and-mortar  
10 retail locations; (b) via the internet through Defendant’s website; and (c) via the internet through  
11 third-party retail websites. Consumers are exposed to cadmium when they consume the Product.

12 2. Under California’s Proposition 65, Health and Safety Code § 25249.5, et seq., it is  
13 unlawful for businesses to knowingly and intentionally expose individuals in California to chemicals  
14 known to the State to cause cancer, birth defects or other reproductive harm without providing clear  
15 and reasonable warnings to individuals prior to their exposure. Defendant introduces a product  
16 contaminated with significant quantities of cadmium into the California marketplace, exposing  
17 consumers of the Product to lead.

18 3. Despite the fact that the Defendant exposes consumers to lead, Defendant provides  
19 no warning, or inadequate warnings about the reproductive hazards associated with cadmium  
20 exposure. Defendant’s conduct thus violates the warning provision of Proposition 65, Health &  
21 Safety Code § 25249.6.

22 **PARTIES**

23 4. Plaintiff brings this enforcement action in the public interest pursuant to Health &  
24 Safety Code § 25249.7(d).

25 5. Defendant SMART & FINAL, LLC (“SMART & FINAL”) is a person in the course  
26 of doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code § 25249.11. SMART & FINAL  
27 manufactures, distributes and/or sells the Product for sale and use in California.  
28



1 developmental toxicity and reproductive harm.

2 13. The level of exposure to a chemical causing reproductive toxicity under Proposition  
3 65 is determined by multiplying the level in question times the reasonably anticipated rate of  
4 exposure for an individual to a given medium. 27 C.C.R. § 25821(b). for exposures to consumer  
5 products, the level of exposure is calculated using the reasonably anticipated rate of intake or  
6 exposure for average users of the consumer product. 27 C.C.R. § 25821(C)(2).

7 14. Defendant's Product contains sufficient quantities of lead such that consumers,  
8 including pregnant women, who consume the Product are exposed to lead. The primary route of  
9 exposure for the violations is direct ingestion when consumers orally ingest the Product. These  
10 exposures occur in homes, workplaces and everywhere in California where the Product is  
11 consumed.

12 15. During the relevant one-year period herein, no clear and reasonable warning was  
13 provided with the Product regarding the reproductive hazards of lead.

14 16. Any person acting in the public interest has standing to enforce violations of  
15 Proposition 65 provided that such person has supplied the requisite public enforcers with a valid  
16 60-Day Notice of Violation and such public enforcers are not diligently prosecuting the action  
17 within such time. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(d).

18 17. More than sixty days prior to naming Defendant in this lawsuit, Plaintiff provided a  
19 60-Day "Notice of Violation of Proposition 65" to the California Attorney General, the District  
20 Attorneys of every county in California, the City Attorneys of every California city with a population  
21 greater than 750,000 and to the named Defendant. In compliance with Health & Safety Code §  
22 25249.7(d) and 27 C.C.R. § 25903(b), each Notice included the following information: (1) the  
23 name and address of each violator; (2) the statute violated; (3) the time period during which  
24 violations occurred; (4) specific descriptions of the violations, including (a) the routes of exposure  
25 to lead from the Product, and (b) the specific type of Product sold and used in violation of  
26 Proposition 65; and (5) the name of the specific Proposition 65-listed chemical that is the subject of  
27 the violations described in each Notice.  
28

1           18. Plaintiff also sent a Certificate of Merit for each Notice to the California Attorney  
2 General, the District Attorneys of every county in California, the City Attorneys of every California  
3 city with a population greater than 750,000 and to the named Defendant. In compliance with  
4 Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(d) and 11 C.C.R. § 3101, each Certificate certified that Plaintiff's  
5 counsel: (1) has consulted with one or more persons with relevant and appropriate experience or  
6 expertise who reviewed facts, studies or other data regarding the exposures to lead alleged in each  
7 Notice; and (2) based on the information obtained through such consultations, believes that there is  
8 a reasonable and meritorious case for a citizen enforcement action based on the facts alleged in  
9 each Notice. In compliance with Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(d) and 11 C.C.R. § 3102, each  
10 Certificate served on the Attorney General included factual information-provided on a confidential  
11 basis-sufficient to establish the basis for the Certificate, including the identity of the person(s)  
12 consulted by the Plaintiff's counsel and the facts, studies or other data reviewed by such persons.

13           19. None of the public prosecutors with the authority to prosecute violations of  
14 Proposition 65 has commenced and/or is diligently prosecuting a cause of action against Defendant  
15 under Health & Safety Code § 25249.5, *et seq.*, based on the claims asserted in each of Plaintiff's  
16 Notices.

17           20. Defendant knows and intends that individuals will consume the Product, thus  
18 exposing them to lead.

19           21. Under Proposition 65, an exposure is "knowing" where the party responsible for  
20 such exposure has:

21  
22           Knowledge of the fact that a[n]...exposure to a chemical listed pursuant to [Health & Safety  
23 Code § 25249.8(a)] is occurring. No knowledge that the... exposure is unlawful is required.  
24 27 C.C.R.§ 25102(n). This knowledge may be either actual or constructive. *See, e.g.*, Final  
25 Statement of Reasons Revised (November 4, 1988) (pursuant to former 22 C.C.R. Division  
26 2, § 12201).

26           22. Defendant has been informed of the lead in their Products by the 60-Day Notice of  
27 Violation and accompanying Certificate of Merit served on them.



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

32. Defendant has failed, and continues to fail, to provide clear and reasonable warnings regarding the reproductive toxicity of lead to users of the Product.

33. By committing the acts alleged above, Defendant has at all times relevant to this Complaint violated Proposition 65 by knowingly and intentionally exposing individuals to lead without first giving clear and reasonable warnings to such individuals regarding the reproductive toxicity of lead.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendant as follows:

1. That the Court, pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b), assess civil penalties against the Defendant in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation of Proposition 65;
2. That the Court, pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a), preliminarily and permanently enjoin Defendant from offering the Product for sale in California without either reformulating the Products such that no Proposition 65 warnings are required or providing prior clear and reasonable warnings, as Plaintiff shall specify in further application to the Court;
3. That the Court, pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a), order Defendant to take action to stop ongoing unwarranted exposures to cadmium resulting from use of Product sold, as Plaintiff shall specify in further application to the Court;
4. That the Court, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 or any other applicable theory or doctrine, grant Plaintiff her reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit; and
5. That the Court grant such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

Dated: August 1, 2021

KJT LAW GROUP, LLP

By: 

Tro Krikorian  
Attorneys for Plaintiff  
BERJ PARSEGHIAN